

opportunities for judge-shopping.” *Tripp v. Exec. Office of President*, 196 F.R.D. 201, 202 (D.D.C. 2000). As such, the related case procedure set forth in Rule 40.5 constitutes an exception to the general rule designed to facilitate the efficient allocation of scarce judicial resources by assigning to the same judge cases that involve a common subject matter and/or parties. See LCvR 40.5(a). “[T]he party seeking related-case designation . . . bear[s] the burden of showing that” Rule 40.5’s requirements are satisfied. *Washington Alliance of Tech. Workers v. D.H.S.*, Civ. No.16-1170, 2016 WL 11184186, at *2 (D.D.C. June 24, 2016). As the judge to whom this case was assigned under the Rule 40.5 procedure, it is my obligation to determine whether plaintiff has met this burden—*i.e.*, I must decide whether the cases in question are, in fact, related. See LCvR 40.5(c)(1).

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that plaintiff shall show cause in writing within 14 days of this Order why the above-captioned case is related to *Klayman v. Obama*, C.A. No. 13-cv-851 for purposes of the Rule 40.5 procedure; and it is further

ORDERED that a hearing on plaintiff’s Notice of Related Case shall be held on Thursday, January 3, 2019, at 3:00 PM in Courtroom 18; and it is further

ORDERED that failure to file a timely response to this Order may result in dismissal of the above-captioned case.

SO ORDERED.



RICHARD J. LEON
United States District Judge